MEMO ENDORSED

Edward Green 08-A-5510 Eastern Correctional Facility P.O. Box 338 Napanoch, New York 12458-0338

January 6, 2015

Attn: Clerk of the Court Hon. Richard Sullivan, U.S.D.J. United States District Court For the Southern District of New York 500 Pearl Street New York, New York 10007

The request for an intension of the Court strict of New York

The request for an intension of the Court strict of New York

The request for an intension of the Court papers will be deed May 8, 2015. The request to the request to the remained

The request for an intension of the court papers will be deed in the request to the remained.

The request for an intension of the request in the request to the remained.

The request for an intension of the reply papers will be deed in the request to the remained.

The request for an intension of the reply papers will be deed in the request to the remained.

The request for an intension of the reply papers will be deed in the request to the request to the remained.

The request for an intension of the reply papers will be deed in the request to the request to the reply papers will be deed in the request to the

Hon. Sullivan:

Specifically identifies the additional lithibit Mr. Green wishes to dochet. Has,

I am writing at this time in request for a ninety-day extension of time to respond the U'Suca Respondent's Answer with supporting memorandum of law. In addition, I am requesting to expand the record under Rule 7(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases to include an exhibit from the state court record the respondents failed to supply the Court with.

Assuming arguendo, the respondents claim, the petitioner's request should be denied because his are meritless, however, to assist the Court in the resolution of the claims presented, the proposed exhibit will substantiate the petitioner's claim of the issue being fairly presented to the state courts, and exhausted for review. O'Sullivan v. Boerckel, 526 U.S. 838, 848 (1999).

In addition, expansion of the record will assist the Court in resolution of the petitioner's claim to rebut the respondents contentions and to illustrate he did inform them of the constitutional nature of his claims when he relied on specific provisions of the Constitution, cited clearly established Supreme Court precedent, and relied upon state and federal cases employing the federal constitutional analysis in his request for relief during appellate and state postconviction review of his claims (Baldwin v. Reese, 541 U.S. 27, 29-31 [2004]).

In sum, the petitioner hopes the requested relief will be granted because it is germane to the issue presented (Williams v. Schiriro, 423 F.Supp.2d 994, 1002-1003 [D. Ariz. 2006]).

Thank you.

Respectfully Submitted,

Edward Green Petitioner *pro-se*